



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra. Edited with a translation and notes and an introduction, together with the text and translation of Bāṇa's Caṇḍīśataka, by GEORGE PAYN QUACKENBOS, A. M., Ph. D., Instructor in Latin in the College of the City of New York. New York, Columbia University Press, 1917. (Volume 9 of Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, edited by A. V. Williams Jackson, Professor of Indo-Iranian Languages in Columbia University.)

Dr. Quackenbos has collected within the covers of this volume all of the extant writings which are with certainty or likelihood attributed to the Sanskrit poet Mayūra, and has added thereto the Caṇḍīśataka of Bāṇa, which tradition says was a rival composition to Mayūra's Sūryaśataka. He has also collected, in his elaborate introduction, all the references which he was able to find in Indian literature or inscriptions to this Mayūra, or to any other person of the name. On the basis of a careful and judicious weighing of these references, he has attempted to reconstruct as much of the life of the poet as can be reconstructed with plausibility. As is unhappily the case with most even of the greatest figures in Indian literary history, the references to Mayūra are all mixt up with obviously legendary stuff, so that there is really nothing that can be said to be known, with absolute certainty, about his life. Our editor seems justified, however, in accepting the tradition that he was the contemporary—probably the rival, and perhaps the father-in-law—of the poet Bāṇa, and like him a protégé of the famous King Harṣa. If this tradition is true, Mayūra must have flourished in the first half of the seventh century A. D. Less certain appears to be the story that he was a jāṅgulika, 'snake-doctor', by profession. He was very likely a Sāura or adherent of sun-worship; almost certainly not a Jaina or a Buddhist.

The tradition that Mayūra was a leper, while very likely a myth, is interesting because of the way in which legend connects it with his two principal compositions. It is said that Mayūra composed a poem of eight stanzas in which he described, in very lascivious language, the charms of his own daughter, Bāṇa's wife. The lady was so enraged when she

heard the poem that she cursed her father with leprosy; whereupon the poet composed a hundred stanzas in praise of the Sun-god, thru whose power his leprosy was removed. This is in itself interesting, and undoubtedly based on good old magico-medical theory; compare the Atharva-veda hymn 1. 22, especially verse 1, in which the sun is used in curing jaundice.

Both of these works are included in the present volume, and in fact they form nearly the whole of Mayūra's extant writings. The rest are merely some scattering verses attributed to Mayūra in various anthologies.

The more interesting of these two works is the *Mayūrāṣṭaka*, or 'Mayūra's Eight (Stanzas)', which Dr. Quackenbos himself discovered and edited for the first time, from a unique manuscript in the library of the University of Tübingen, in JAOS. 31. 343 ff. This edition and the accompanying translation are reprinted, with slight changes, in the present book. Unhappily the manuscript is damaged, so that two of the eight stanzas are fragmentary. Facsimiles are furnished in this book of the three pages of the manuscript, which is written in Śāradā characters. The poem is ultra-erotic in character, and fits very well the tradition about its origin. Indeed, as the editor remarks, we can hardly blame the lady to whom it was addressed for being offended by its obscenity.

Much better known, but to the general reader less interesting, is the *Sūryaśataka* or 'Hundred (Stanzas in praise) of the Sun'. It consists in its present form of 101 stanzas; the last stanza, which may possibly be a later addition, is an *envoi* promising absolution from sins and freedom from disease to the mortal who shall read thru the work but once, with proper devotion. Some readers may think that some such reward would be well earned. The poem is an example of the extreme of the so-called *Kāvya* style. In many of its verses there is not lacking a certain magnificence. Ornament is piled on elaborate ornament, till the result reminds one of a Hindu temple. And one cannot but admire the ingenuity with which a rather limited theme is varied and modulated by the exuberant fancy of the poet. But it must be said that this ingenuity often manifests itself not so much in genuine poetic images as in elaborate and intricate mazes of puns—long concatenations of plays upon words, which drive the translator to desperation. For instance, Dr. Quackenbos not infrequently has to translate an entire stanza twice, to bring out the double meanings which run thru the whole of it. This is, of course, characteristic of this whole sphere of Sanskrit poetry. Mythological allusions, too, are very abundant, and furnish the poet with many of the poetic figures of which he must have been most proud. It is not, of course, the poet's fault that these greatly add to the obscurity of his poem to Westerners. Dr. Quackenbos's very full and

excellent notes ¹ furnish an indispensable first-aid in this respect, as in many others. But when all has been done that can be done, many of the stanzas must remain—as indeed the poet undoubtedly intended that they should—objects of study and meditation rather than of casual reading. They are puzzles, rather than what we understand by literature. This is quite typical of the esthetic ideals of the Kāvya style. Even a Sanskritist—nay, even our very diligent and careful editor—must admit in a few cases that the meaning remains obscure to him, in spite of the utmost pains. *Kim punar anye 'py anabhivyuktāḥ*—what then can we expect of more casual readers?

The Caṇḍīśataka, or 'Hundred (Stanzas in praise) of Caṇḍī', by Bāṇa, said to have been written in rivalry against the Sūryaśataka of Mayūra, is in general a work of the same sort. Its (accurately) 102 stanzas are devoted to the laud of the goddess Caṇḍī or Pārvatī, consort of Īva. And in fact all but four of them deal with one single myth about her—her slaying of the demon Mahiṣa by a blow of her foot (which in one stanza is ungallantly compared to the Vindhya Mountain). This limitation of the theme makes the stanzas considerably more monotonous than those of the Sūryaśataka. But on the other hand the language, tho by no means simple, is much less intricate and difficult than that of the rival poem; it is much easier reading.

While, as has been said, the Mayūrāśataka has never been edited or translated except by Dr. Quackenbos (nor is there any native commentary to it), the editor was assisted in his work on the two other poems by editions and native commentaries, and in the case of the Sūryaśataka by the Italian translation of Bernheimer. His work, however, is independent and scholarly. His attitude towards the Hindu commentators appears to be judiciously critical. I have even noted one or two instances in which it seems to me that he has unwisely departed from the commentator's explanation (e. g. C. Ś. 46, note 4). As I have no access to the commentators, I can judge of this matter only by the editor's quotations from them in his notes. Occasionally, of course, opinions may differ as to whether the editor is right in following the commentary. Thus, in S. Ś. 55 c, it seems to me that *nandināndīnīnādaḥ* clearly means "Nandi's joyful shout", and that the commentator's gloss *murajaviśeṣa*, "a kind of drum", for *nāndī*, which as Q. says has no warrant in any lexicon, should be disregarded. But on the whole I am much impressed with the zeal and care and good scholarly judgment which Dr. Quackenbos has applied to his none too easy task.

¹ The notes are indeed rather too full. They frequently dilate at length on simple or obvious matters.

It is in large measure not Quackenbos's fault, as I have intimated, that in spite of all his energy and intelligence there remain, after all, quite a good many points, large and small, which are in need of further elucidation. Of this Quackenbos—who is nothing if not modest, sometimes almost over-modest—is of course quite aware. As anyone who has ever been a text-editor knows, it is bound to happen that a few things will occur to one who takes up a text for the first time, which have not occurred to another who knows the text by heart—just for that very reason. Freshness of approach gives a certain advantage, especially if it can rest upon the results attained by the patient study of others. So, standing on the broad shoulders of Quackenbos's labors, I have tried to pick a few still ungathered fruits from this *durāroha-druma*, tree that is not easily scaled. I hope the following remarks may add something, if only a little, to the understanding of the text.

S. Ś. 29 a, *tīvraṃ nirvāṇahetur*, and S. Ś. 86 c, *tāpasyā 'pi hetur . . . ekanirvāṇadāyī*. Q. fails to remember here that the literal meaning of *nirvāṇa* is "extinction" (as of fire); cf. C. Ś. 34 a, where he understands it correctly. The sun is "hot", or "the cause of heat", yet also "the cause (the sole giver) of *nirvāṇa* (extinction—as of fire or heat)."—In the same stanza S. Ś. 29, I think *iha . . . āparam* in pāda b means "in this world . . . in the other world" rather than "near . . . remote."

S. Ś. 12 d, *acaramāś*, of the rays of the sun, is questioningly rendered "(not-western, that is) eastern". It means "having no last", that is, of which none is the last, appearing simultaneously, not *seriatim*; all equal and like. It is not recorded elsewhere, to my knowledge, in Classical Sanskrit, tho it is used once in the Rigveda (5. 58. 5, of the Maruts, compared to the spokes of a wheel, "all equal"); and in Pāli *apubbaṃ acarimam* together are used in the same sense in the Milinda-pañha (Trenckner, page 40, third line from bottom), and in other places, meaning "in a manner having no first and no last", "simultaneously" (cf. Morris, JPTS. 1887, p. 101, and Rhys Davids, SBE. XXXV, p. 64).

S. Ś. 21 c, *kartum nā 'laṃ nimeṣam divasaṃ api param yat* is rendered: "And it (the sun) is unable to <make> a wink, altho it can <create> the noble day" (the angle-brackets are used by Q. to indicate translations of *doubles ententes*). I should render: "It is unable to make a wink (punningly, a minute), but on the other hand (it can make) a day." *Nimeṣa* means both "wink" and "minute" or "instant", a small unit of time; *param* I think is an adverb. Sūrya is of course proverbially the "Day-maker". Bernheimer's rendering, quoted in Q.'s note, is wholly wrong. The point is that the Sun can

and does make a day, which is a large period of time, tho it cannot make a (small period of time, an instant; but really, a) wink.

S. S. 75 c, *kālavayālasya cihnam*: "it (the sun's disk) is the (crest-) ornament of the Serpent Time." Q. renders "Serpent of Time" and is uncertain who is meant; the serpent is Time itself, for, in Sanskrit as in English, Time is "creeping". In Vikramacarita, Metrical Recension 9 (11). 10, occurs the phrase *dinamaniḥ sarpatkālasarpaçiromaniḥ*, "the jewel of day (the sun), the head-gem of the serpent, creeping Time." This is a strikingly perfect parallel to the expression under discussion.

These are the most important and certain of the corrections of the translation which I have been able to make. The rest are either minor points, or less certain. With them I follow the order of the printed book.

Mayūrāṣṭaka: 1 a: *prastutāṅgī*, perhaps "with limbs prepared (for love)" rather than "with beautiful limbs."—d: read "*gūhya* (*āgūhya*)"?—2 c, and 5 d: *kena* in both cases to be taken as attributive to the following instrumental noun: "by what bee . . .", "by what demon . . ."—5 a: may not *pathī* be for *pathi*, "on the path", with metrical lengthening of *i*?—7 b: *prabhācandravat*, perhaps "like the resplendent moon (in its crescent shape)."—8 a: *bhāva* in connexion with *hāva* must, I think, mean "passion"; the two terms are frequently associated thus. "Shining with love, allurements, and passion."

Sūryaśataka: 6 c: *nighna*, perhaps better "full of" than "subject [only] to."—8 d: I think *khacita* means "studded", as if with jewels.—10 a: *bandha*, in the second rendering, "enclosure (in the bud)".—b: probably no *double entente* in *lokānām*.—d: *ketavaḥ* perhaps "eclipsers" (and punningly, "rays"). Ketu, the Dragon's Tail, the ninth planet, is mythologically the body of the demon of eclipse, whose head is Rāhu.—15 a: *madhura* better "charming" than "soft", in both renderings.—18 b, c: the passage is hard, but I suggest that *pradeśasthito 'pi* goes with the following. "Tho it remains fixedly (appears regularly) in (the same) place (it always comes in the east), because of due regard for place and time, still it attains to the name of 'new' in Indra's quarter (it is nevertheless called 'new' every time it arises)".—23 b: the concept of "ink" is not needed for *kajjala*; darkness is directly compared to lamp-black.—25 a: *praśamita*°, "that is powerful enough to overcome the strength of the mighty stars."—b: *līlayā*, "easily" rather than "scornfully"?—30: tho Q.'s general idea is correct, I should phrase his summary of the stanza (in note 1) rather thus: "The splendor of jewels is useful for ornamentation; of fire, for burning wood etc.; of the moon, for giving refreshment by its own coolness; but the splendor of

the sun exceeds each of these in its own field; for it adorns *the three worlds*, burns *sin*, and gives refreshment by *rain*.”—31 d: *avalidham* is literally “lickt”.—32 d: I do not think there is any *double entente* in *añjana*, which probably cannot mean “fire”, in spite of Viçva in ÇKDr.—38 b: *parihṛta*°, “envelops, because of its subtilty, the utmost recesses” etc.; *upānta* adjective.—39 c: *diñmukhānām*, simply “quarters” (literally, faces of the q.). There is something wrong with this line; *anu* can hardly be rendered twice as Q. has done; but I don’t see thru it.—42 d: *sphuṭa*°, perhaps also punningly, of the sun: “it is the occasion of the expanded-lotus-cup” (*apāçraya*=*āçraya*).—45 b: *-prihuśvāsa*-, “their panting is abundant”; *śrameṇa* should be translated with this line, “parcht with fatigue.”—d: *sarala*, “outstrecht” (necks).—46 c: *kaṭaka*, “ridge”, better than “zone”; *kliṣṭasūtā* doubtless has the meaning suggested as a second alternative in note 9, cf. 48 c.—48, note 5, last line on page; the point is lost unless “mares” be substituted for “other horses”.—52 a: *dūranamrāir*, “who make obeisance from a (respectful) distance.”—55 b: *param* probably adverb, “moreover”.—d: *vinatānandanah*, simply “son of V.”—56 c: *kula*-, “noble” (lit. “of [good] family”).—62 d: *avataran*, “arriving at, coming to.”—78 b: *taḍiti* seems to be rendered “with a crash”; of course it means “with a flash of lightning.”—85 c: *aparavaśo*, perhaps “subdued, not one’s own master”, and so “ill”, cf. *a-svastha*.—98 b, c: I think Bernheimer was right in taking *gām* as “earth” and *-grāva*- as “rocks”; *go* “sky” and *grāvan* “clouds” are supported only by Nāigh.—Understand *vīṭina* literally, “melted”.

Anthology Stanzas: Śiva and Pārvatī, 2 a: *kim me durodarena*, means (freely) “what did I say about the dice-play? (that is, I didn’t say anything about it)”.

Caṇḍīśataka: 3 c and 4 d: *jayati*, *jayanti* should be translated “hail to”, as has been rightly done in 21, 33, 38, 54, 71, 102.—18 d: *kula*-, “noble”, seems to be omitted in the translation.—37 d: would it not be better to take *kurvānā sarvam* with the prec., “doing everything as before in the case of Paçupati”, and *īṣad* as part of the fol. cpd., “with slightly laid-on foot-lac”?—39 a: *āvyomavyāpisiṃnām* would be much better taken as a cpd., as suggested in note.—46 a: *dhr̥tim akr̥ta*, perhaps better “did (not) stop still”, in both cases (in the first case perhaps with double meaning, “took no pleasure”); *dele* “because of his fondness for dissension”.—67 c: *mātur* better with *mahiṣavadhamahe*?—97, note 3: this is correct, but it should have been brought out clearly in the translation; it is a commonplace use of *kva* . . . *kva*.—102 d: *sarvāṅgīṇam*, perhaps adverb, “whole-body-wise”, “in a manner that affected his whole body”; or if adj., “with his whole body”; in any

case the body must be Mahiṣa's, not Caṇḍi's. I think Q. fails to understand quite what is meant by Monier Williams' definition. Bühler's rendering is free but essentially correct.

On page 237, V. L. to Bāṇa's 'Traveler', (c), Q. reads *cch* for *ch* "for metrical reasons"—quite unnecessarily, since *ch* always counts as a double consonant for metrical purposes. So he repeatedly prints *cch* at the beginning of a word, where *ch* is more proper; e. g. C. Ś. 22 a.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400. By JOHN EDWIN WELLS, M. L., M. A., Ph. D., Professor of English Literature in Beloit College. Published under the Auspices of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1916.

This is an admirable piece of work. When a mature scholar who might well have been devoting himself to his own problems spends years in searching, compiling and summarizing to form a tool which will save others from having to do the like, we can only say 'Ingentes gratias agimus', without the risk of eternally scratching ourselves among the flatterers. Indeed, the perseverance, grasp and judgment involved in an extensive critical bibliography make it of the nature of a direct contribution to knowledge; it is a history of scholarship on the subject concerned.

The increase of such tools as concordances and bibliographies gives us the agreeable feeling that early English studies have passed out of their nonage. There may be a little regret that we can less often than once look at each other with a wild surmise as some new planet swims into our ken, though even that pleasure may still be had; but we can be more confident of not overlooking an old one, and can more easily make the combinations which produce new knowledge, and can in some sort grasp the scheme of things entire. Such bibliographies as those of Ward and Herbert, and Miss Billings' incomplete one, for the romances, that of Child for the ballads, Miss Hammond's for Chaucer, C. F. Brown's for the religious lyric (Bibliographical Society, 1916), and those in the Cambridge History of English Literature, give us in more or less degree this feeling of confidence and grasp. There is still greatly needed a bibliography for the Middle English (and Anglo-